

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/722,996	11/27/2000	Jiming Sun	884.334US1	4899	
21186 759	90 11/02/2004	•	EXAMINER		
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.			AWAD, AMR A		
	P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2675		
		•	DATE MAILED: 11/02/200	DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/722,996	SUN, JIMING			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Amr Awad	2675			
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1, after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a region of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be a ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro te, cause the application to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2004.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Th	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bures * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica ority documents have been recei au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ntion No ved in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail I				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2675

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 10-11, 13-19, 21-22, 24-25, 27-28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (US Patent NO. 5,832,296.hereinafter referred to as Wang) in view of Liao et al. (US patent NO. 6,570,556; hereinafter referred to as Liao).

As to independent claim 1, Wang (figure 1) teaches a pointing device (10) which includes a ring (12), a sensor unit comprising a sensor (16) in substantially circular pattern and mounted on the ring, and wherein the sensor unit is adapted to create position information (col. 4, lines 21-38). The sensor s adapted to control a pointer on a display screen (col. 7, lines 6-18), and a controller (processor 42) for creating a position based on activation of the sensor (col. 5, lines 25-35).

Wang does not expressly teach that the sensor unit (16) comprises a plurality of sensors, and wherein each sensor can be activates for positioning the pointer on the display screen.

However, Liao teaches a pointing device to control a pointer on a display that includes a plurality of sensors (422) in a substantially circular pattern to activate

Art Unit: 2675

positioning the pointer on the display screen (figures 4 and col. 2, line 57 through col. 3, line 14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the sensors taught by Liao to replace the sensor (16) of Wang's device so as motivated by Liao, to increase the conductivity of the pointing device (col. 1, lines 54-57), as well as to provide an accurate movement of the cursor by providing a plurality of sensors.

As to claim 2, as can be seen in figure 2, the ring (12) is a size that is capable of being worn by a human digit.

As to claim 5, as can be seen in figure 2, Wang shows that the pointing device is capable of being operated by human thumb.

As to claim 6, as can be seen in figure 3, Wang shows a controller (processor 42) mounted to the ring wherein the controller is coupled to the sensor (14, 16, 18 and 20), a transmitter (48) coupled to the controller to translate the signal to movement information (col. 5, lines 18-50).

As to claim 7, Wang teaches that the pointing device (12) can be used as a mouse (abstract), which inherently means that the device control a pointer on a display. As to claim 8, Wang teaches that the pointing device (12) includes, a pressure sensor (14) (col. 4, lines 23-26).

As to claims 10-1 1, Wang shows that the sensors are pressure sensors, which may be either inductance or capacitance.

As to claims 13-19, 21-22, 24-25, 27-28 and 30, the claims are similar to claims

Art Unit: 2675

Eng).

1-2, 5-8 and 10-1 1, and would be analyzed as previously discussed with respect to these claims.

3. Claims 3-4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang and Liao in view of Eng et al. (US patent NO. 5,638,092 hereinafter referred to as

As can be seen above, Wang teaches all the limitations of claims 3-4 and 20 except the citations of having selection button mounted on the ring and wherein the selection button is capable of being operated by a human thumb.

However, Eng (figure 1) teaches a pointing device (101) that include a selection button (120) which can be operated by the user's thumb (col. 3, line 46 through col. 4, line 9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Eng having a selecting switch mounted on the ring to be incorporated to Wang's device so as to be able to easily use the device as an input device (mouse), which make the device user friendly, as well as to increase the versatility of the device.

4. Claims 9, 12, 23, 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang and Liao in view of Russell (US patent NO. 5,481,265).

Art Unit: 2675

As to claims 9 and 23, Wang does not teach that the plurality of sensors are rocker switches (note that Eng teaches that a touch sensitive pad is preferred to a mechanical switch because of the force required to activate or deactivate a mechanical switch can cause unwanted finger motion (col. 5, lines 30-33) which clearly suggests that a mechanical switches can be used.

However, Russell (figures IA, IB and 7B) teaches a user interface (10) that can be worn in the user's finger, and wherein the device includes a plurality of mechanical switches (1a, lb, lc and 1d) (col. 1 1, lines 7-27, and 51-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Russell having mechanical switches to replace Wang's touch switches, because as described above by Eng, mechanical switches may be used, which make such choice purely designed choice based on the environment and the way in which the device operated.

As to claims 12, 26 and 29, Wang does not expressly teach using infrared to transmit the information.

However, Russell teaches a pointing device which uses infrared to transmit the information to the computer device (col. 6, lines 41-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Russell using an infrared transmitter to be used in Wang's transmitter because infrared technology is known for its reliability and efficiency. Furthermore, Russell teaches that transmitter can be any of

Art Unit: 2675

the known technologies (infrared, radio and acoustic). Therefore, using any of theses methods is also based on the designer choice.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2675

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amr Awad whose telephone number is (703)308-8485. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Fridary from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (703)305-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.A

AMR A. AWAD PRIMARY EXAMINER

Amr ARmed Awwen